



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,636	04/08/2004	Sridhar Ranganathan	17,872	8821

7590 12/26/2007  
Pauley Petersen & Erickson  
Suite 365  
2800 West Higgins Road  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195

EXAMINER
----------

HAND, MELANIE JO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/26/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

H

**Interview Summary****Application No.**

10/820,636

**Applicant(s)**

RANGANATHAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Melanie J. Hand

**Art Unit**

3761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Melanie J. Hand.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) John Poliak.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 17, 30 and 41-46.Identification of prior art discussed: Suzuki (JP 2003-033381).Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA  
 SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant requested interview to discuss proposed amendments to the independent claim listed above. The proposed amendment to claims 1, 41 and new claims 44 and 45 recite the limitation that the claimed structure is flat in a dry state. Examiner advised applicant that Fig. 10 of Suzuki shows the instant article prior to expansion and not having any concavity, thus being flat, and therefore the amendment to claims 1, 41 and new claims 44 and 45 are still rejected over 102 or alternatively 103 as anticipated by or obvious over Suzuki. The amendment to claims 17, 30, 42, 43 and new claim 46 now set forth the limitation of an absorbent second layer comprising polyurethane foam. Examiner agreed that this limitation overcomes the current rejections of those claims over Suzuki alone or in combination with Carlucci. Applicant stated that a second reference was improperly relied upon in the 102/103 rejection over Suzuki with respect to some claims. The rejection was not a 102/104 but rather a 103 that fell under the wrong claim heading. Further, it appears that these claims were subject to a restriction requirement that was never responded to by applicant and appears to have been dropped by the previous examiner. Upon receipt of the proposed amendment, examiner will issue another written restriction requirement.